



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,715	03/22/2004	Carl J. Kraenzel	LOT920000010US2	9245
67046	7590	03/11/2009		
HOLLAND & KNIGHT 10 ST. JAMES AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02116-3889				
EXAMINER				
KE, PENG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/11/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/805,715

**Applicant(s)**

KRAENZEL ET AL.

**Examiner**

SIMON KE

**Art Unit**

2174

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-20, 25, 28 and 31-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-20, 25, 28, and 31-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 12/11/09.

Claims 14-20, 25, 28, and 31-45 are pending in this application. Claims 14, 25, 28, and 31 are independent claims.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Claims 1-13, 21-24, 26-27, and 29-30 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group I, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 12/11/08.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-15, 19-20, 25, 28, 31-33, 37-40, and 44-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghoneimy US Publication 2004/0078373 in view of Rice US Publication 2002/0174010.

As per claim 14, Ghoneimy 20040078373 teaches a system of administrator tools for defining a subscription in a workflow, enterprise and mail-enabled application server, comprising:

a developer defined template file of design elements initializing design of said subscription; (see Ghoneimy, paragraph 0041)

a server side user interface responsive to said template file for defining an offline configuration document for said subscription; (see Ghoneimy, paragraph 0069) and

However, Ghonemy fails to teach a server side user interface responsive to said template file for defining offline security for said subscription.

Rice teaches a server side user interface responsive to said template file for defining security for said subscription. (see Rice, fig. 3b, paragraph 0110)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Rice's teaching with method of Ghoneimy in order to provide user with security settings.

As per claim 15, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the system of claim 14. Ghoneimy further teaches said offline configuration document further comprising:

tabbed pages for presenting defaults of properties for client subscriptions.(see Ghoneimy, paragraph 0210)

As per claim 19, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the system of 14. Rice further teaches said offline security for said subscription being configured by a security policy form presenting for administrator selection security domain definition and ID deployment policy. (see Rice, fig. 3b, paragraph 0110; Link id is ID deployment policy)

As per claim 20, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the system of claim 19. Rice further teaches said ID deployment policy including selection options for prompt, auto generate, and directory lookup deployment of IDs. (see Rice, fig. 3b, paragraph 0110; Link id is ID deployment policy)

As per claim 25, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15. Supra.

As per claim 28, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15. Supra.

As per claim 31, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15. Supra.

As per claim 32, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the method of claim 25., Ghoneimy further teaches said subscriptions providing a logical grouping of data, application implementations, and application-instance security context and off-line subscriptions containing client-side runtime and framework for a fully functioning offline server. (see Ghoneimy, paragraph 0069)

As per claim 33, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the method of claim 32, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15. Supra.

As per claim 37, which is dependent on the method of claim 32, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 19. Supra

As per claim 38, which is dependent on the method of claim 37, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20. Supra.

As per claim 39, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the program storage device of claim 28. Rice further teaches said operations further comprising:

defining said subscriptions as a logical grouping of data, application implementations, and application-instance security context and defining off-line subscriptions as containing client-side runtime and framework for a fully functioning offline server. (see Rice, fig. 3b, paragraph 0110; Link id is ID deployment policy)

As per claim 40, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the program storage device of claim 39. it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15. Supra.

As per claims 44 and 45, they are rejected under the same rationale as claims 19 and 20. Supra.

Claims 16-18, 41-43, 34-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghoneimy US Publication 2004/0078373 in view of Rice US Publication 2002/0174010.

As per claim 16, Ghoneimy and Rice teach the system of claim 15. Ghoneimy further teaches said tabbed pages including a basic page,(see Ghoneimy, paragraph 0111) a services page, (see Ghoneimy, paragraph 0032) and a download page field. (see Ghoneimy, 0111)

However, they fail to teach a schedules page, a rules page.

Wright 6004276 teaches a schedules page (See Wright, fig. 17D; col. 33, lines 25-45) and a rules page. (see Wright fig. 94B; col. 114, lines 20-35)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Wright's teaching with method of Ghoneimy in ordering provide uses with the ability to synchronize the schedules.

As per claim 17, Ghoneimy, Rice, and Wright teach the system of claim 16. Wright further teaches said tabbed pages providing for administrator selection services to install offline, custom services to install offline, synchronization schedule, frequency, imitations and exceptions, and synchronization rules. (see Wright, col. 101, lines 52-col. 102, lines 12)

As per claim 18, Ghoneimy, Rice and Wright teach the system of claim 17. Wright further teaches said synchronization rules selectively defining file rules, date filtering synchronization options, halt conditions synchronization options, and synchronization optional actions. (see Wright, col. 101, lines 52-col. 102, lines 12)

As per claims 41-43, they are rejected under the same rationale as claims 16-18. Supra.

As per claims 34-36, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 16-18. Supra.

#### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke  
/Peng Ke/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174